DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 278 FL 012 030

AUTHOR Furey, Patricia R.
TITLE A Framework for Cross-Cultural Analysis of Teaching Methods.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 24p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (San Francisco, CA, March 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication: *Cultural Differences: *English (Second Language): Student Attitudes: Student Teacher Relationship: Teacher Response: Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The intent of the framework presented here is to provide a scheme for thinking about cultural differences as they relate to what goes on in the English as a Second Language (ESL) class. The categories are: (1) cultural values: (2) views of teacher-role: (3) modes of learning: (4) teacher-student interaction patterns, and (5) norms of interaction (communicative competence rules). Each category compares the particular value or behavior in the general culture with the corresponding value in the classroom. The discussion of each category and sub-category explores differences in attitude between the foreign student and American students, or between other cultural backgrounds and the dominant American cultural pattern. The framework provides a guideline in the process of exploring cultural differences as they apply to teaching methods and classroom practices. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196278

A Framework for Cross-Cultural Analysis of Teaching Methods

© Patricia R. Furey

Department of General Linguistics

University of Pittsburgh

Paper Presented at TESOL 80

San Francisco, Cal.

March, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P.R. Furey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL012030

A Framework for Cross-Cultural Analysis of Teaching Methods

Patricia R. Furey
University of Pittsburgh

As Saville-Troike (1976), Paulston (1975) and others have pointed out, the EFL/ESL classroom is most often a culture contact setting where the students' cultural values and expectations of the learning process may diverge significantly from those of the teacher and curriculum designer. However, in selecting, implementing, and evaluating teaching methods we rarely pay sufficient attention to whether they are suitable for students whose notions of appropriate classroom behaviors and perceptions of student/teacher roles may differ from those providing their English training. This paper offers a framework to assist in determining the cross-cultural appropriateness of our teaching methods. Based on sources in FL teaching methodology, intercultural communications, and educational anthropology it identifies and examines those factors in our methods and classroom practices which must be systematically compared with relevant features of our students' cultures in assessing the suitability of our instruction and suggesting where we must provide special orientation for those from a particular cultural background. Cultural values, the role of the teacher, modes of learning, teacher-student interaction patterns, and norms of interaction must all be considered in cross-cultural analysis. Examples of applications of the framework are provided with reference to selected cultural groups and current methodologies.

Teachers are so often concerned with teaching the body of material and series of skills explicitly designated in an official curriculum that they often forget that students are also learning a hidden curriculum

(Jackson, 1968) — one which transmits the values, attitudes, and norms of behavior of the culture in which their education is set. But not only is the school a locus of broader culture learning; the classroom is its own subculture, and students must learn the highly patterned ways of thinking and behaving appropriate to it. Our adult ESL/EFL students come to our classes, then, with their own sets of values, attitudes, and beliefs about the world in general and about the classroom and learning in particular. This fact implies that along with linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical factors, we must also consider cultural differences as we select, implement, and evaluate our teaching methods and classroom practices and orient our students to them.

It is not my contention that cross-cultural comparison will predict the success or failure of particular methods, nor am I asserting that all differences are necessarily problematic. I am not suggesting that we change our instructional strategies to conform to the ones our students are used to. As Philips (1972) points out, this is a disservice to those students who will eventually have to adapt to the learning patterns of the English speaking culture. What should be useful is a framework specifying those features that provide a basis for cross-cultural comparison of teaching methods and classroom practices — a cultural checklist consisting of categories which the teacher or curriculum planner should investigate in order to anticipate possible sources of misunderstanding, conflict, or difficulty in the multicultural classroom.

The categories contained in the framework are drawn from three main sources. Many have emerged from my own experience and that of my colleagues at the ELI, University of Pittsburgh. Others were suggested

during interviews with trained EFL teachers having experience in teaching both in the U.S. and other cultures. Finally, literature in sociolinguistics, educational anthropology, and intercultural communications provided information contributing to the development of the framework.

Some of the categories by their very nature involve only the subculture of the classroom; others involve both the general culture and its parallels in the classroom subculture. The relationship between these two systems is an interesting one and needs further comment. Very often certain values, attitudes, and behavioral patterns of the general culture are directly reflected in and reinforced by the educational setting. On the other hand, there are many similarities in classrooms across societies which in numerous other respects are quite dissimilar. This probably has to do with the pervasive influence and levelling effect of Western thought on education throughout so much of the world. Also, of course, formal education is a phenomenon with certain inherent and universal features which supersede any particular cultural setting.

The framework offered here is a partial and tentative one. Its intent is to provide a scheme for thinking about cultural differences as they relate to what goes on in the EFL/ESL class. What is clearly needed is more hard data — systematic comparative research in pedagogy and classroom practice which will enable us to better understand cultural aspects of instruction and eventually develop a more complete and refined model for cross-cultural analysis of teaching methods. As it now stands, the framework consists of five major categories each of which contains various related subcategories. The first category is Cultural Values.

FIGURE 1

Cultural Values

GENERAL CULTURE	CULTURE OF THE CLASSROOM
Differences in:	Differences in:
A. Individualism/Group orientation	A. Individual competition, sense of privacy about individual work, striving for individual achievement/ Group co-operation, sharing among students, desire not to stand apart from group or lose face vis-à-vis group
B. Attitudes toward use of time	B. Notions of how much is to be covered at what rate, importance of efficiency of procedures, punctuality, correctness vs. speed, etc.
C. Values relating to purpose of education in general and relative importance of different kinds of education	C. Relative emphasis on learning an authoritative body of knowledge, on practical education, on political education, on acquiring the right credentials, on preserving the past vs. encouraging change, etc.

For purposes of illustration we can consider three cultural values in an attempt to show how they bear on consideration of teaching methods and classroom practices. For a thorough, systematic investigation of differences in cultural values it is helpful to check value inventories such as the one in Condon's and Yousef's An Introduction to Intercultural Communication (1975).

Cross-cultural variation in individualism vs. group orientation is one of the most frequently discussed value differences. The United States is regarded as a society in which the individual is paramount while the orientation in many cultures is more toward the group. To fit in harmoniously with ones social group may be a dominant goal reflected in the daily patterns of life in some cultures, and to avoid losing face or being shamed vis-à-vis group members is of utmost importance in many societies. In exploring how broader cultural differences in individualism vs. group orientation are evidenced in the culture of the classroom we must be very careful because each value operates differently in different cultures and is manipulated in various ways in the educational setting. We can't, for example, conclude that a strong sense of competition doesn't exist in group oriented cultures. In Japan, a highly group directed society, places at the leading universities are fiercely competed for. However, as Shimahara (1978) points out, fueling the individual competition for university admission is the intense need to establish oneself within a group since the school one attends often determines the company one joins -- usually a lifelong and all encompassing commitment in Japan. A different sort of dynamic underlies academic competition in the U.S.

where the ultimate goal is individual success and where ones affiliation with social and work groups may be much more transitory and less binding than in Japan. Furthermore, while the Japanese student may need to be highly competitive with his peers for opportunities in higher education, competition in the classroom itself is not realized in the same way as in U. S. schools. Indeed, many Asian students report embarrassment at being singled out for attention or praise by teachers.

Similarly, studies of various groups of American Indian children (e.g. Philips, 1972; Cazden and John, 1971) who come from more group directed cultures indicate that students may enthusiastically compete against one another in teams or work groups but are hesitant to overtly compete on an individual basis or to speak out in front of the entire class.

The strong tendency toward individual competition in U.S. education is related to another phenomenon often noticed by foreign students. In this country there is a greater sense of privacy and individual ownership about ones work and achievement. Many students from other cultures report that there is more openness about sharing of information in their countries. One fellow teacher commented to me that in Korea a student once apologized for not handing in his work because he had to write a report for a friend. Our standards of cheating and plagiarism are culture bound, and the implications for our students — especially those headed for academic work at an American institution — are clear. It must be made very explicit what constitutes cheating and plagiarism, and procedures for citing another's work, listing references, etc. must be taught thoroughly.

Another pedagogical implication of cultural differences in individualism

and group orientation is that members of many strongly group oriented cultures tend to feel keenly shame or ridicule vis-à-vis the group. Classroom practices leading to undeserved loss of face for students are going to be humiliating and most likely counterproductive. Some of the newer FL methodologies are radically different from those our students are used to, and individuals who have difficulty with them or fail to learn from them may experience a strong sense of shame and loss of face. An important point here is that methods based on group dynamics are not necessarily especially appropriate for students from strongly group directed cultures, and we must keep in mind that students from many of these cultures are used to much more traditional methods. Further, because of the very nature of the methods, students are more intensely involved with the group and therefore risk greater loss of face in failing.

Considering subcategory B, attitudes toward use of time, ever since Hall's publication of The Silent Language (1966), we have been more aware of culturally conditioned concepts of time and attitudes toward its use. The U.S. is generally characterized as a fast paced culture emphasizing efficiency, speed, and punctuality, and we might expect to see these features contrasting sharply in the classroom with characteristics of cultures having different views toward time and its use. Many intensive English students in this country do remark on the extreme difficulties they experience with timed exercises and tests and make the common observation that people here always seem to be in a hurry. On the other hand, the informants interviewed for this research claim that in their countries there is heavy pressure to cover a certain amount of material in a specified sequence of time, and

many state that because of the prevalence of more deductive, lecture-type methods than in the U.S., material is covered at a faster rate in their home countries, a phenomenon also noted by Grove (1977) in his study of the cross-cultural problems of Portuguese immigrant students. Quite possibly because of the requirements inherent in the educational domain we may not find as many intercultural differences in use of time inside the classroom as outside in the broader culture. However, many of our students do need training and practice in doing timed tests and exercises.

Considering subcategory C, we find that different cultures value different kinds of education for different reasons. In Viet Nam there is a strong veneration of book learning, for example, and several colleagues from Asian countries have reported that their education tends to be more theoretical than practical although this seems to be changing. Saville-Troike (1976) notes that in some cultures preservation of the existing culture is an important aim of education whereas in other societies the educational process encourages change. In places where there is a shortage of qualified personnel or where getting a good job depends primarily on merely having a credential and from there knowing the right people or belonging to the right political party, motivation to come to class regularly and study hard may be lower than in cultures where jobs are allocated on the basis of accomplishments in school.

Since the perceived purpose of education affects what material is presented, how it is learned, and the degree and type of student motivation, it is crucial for us to know if there are strong cultural differences between our students' and our own conceptions of the purpose of education and the value of different kinds of learning.

The second major category to be considered is Views Toward the Teacher.

FIGURE 2

Views Toward the Teacher

GENERAL CULTURE	CULTURE OF THE CLASSROOM
Differences in:	Differences in:
A. Views on status, prestige of teacher; norms of appropriate distance between student and teacher	A. Rules of deference, propriety; degree of formality/informality between student and teacher
B. Views on rights and obligations of teachers, i.e. teacher role	B. 1. Degree of authority invested in and expected from teacher 2. Degree to which teacher directs, dominates classroom activities 3. Expectation of teacher as scholar, sage 4. Expectation of teacher as counselor, advisor 5. Expectation of teacher as personal tutor

Those who have studied or taught in more than one culture are often struck by the strong differences in attitudes surrounding the teacher and are surprised at the extent to which culturally conditioned ideas about the teacher role are reflected in norms of classroom behavior. Considering subcategory A, classroom subcultures may vary widely in their norms for verbal and non-verbal demonstration of deference and formality and thereby reflect broader cultural views on the degree of status and prestige due the teacher and the appropriate social distance to be maintained between student and teacher. In societies where teachers have traditionally been guardians of a sacred body of knowledge they tend to be treated with greater formality and distance. Many Arab and Asian students reveal their surprise at the informal ways both American students and teachers dress and sit in the classroom, and nearly all students from other cultures are puzzled by the generally casual manner in which American students approach and speak to their teachers.

However, in terms of implications for our language teaching methods, the most important category here has to do with cultural differences in views on the rights and obligations of the teacher, subcategory B. In many cultures the teacher exercises greater authority and plays a highly directive role in determining and controlling what goes on in the classroom. Japanese and Korean students are less likely to challenge or even question the teacher although this may be changing somewhat with the younger generation. Egyptians have told me that the teacher in the classroom fills the role of the father or mother in the family, and therefore students hesitate to overtly challenge his or her authority.

In at least some Latin American countries, on the other hand, students are free to question the teacher, to dispute the relevance of what is being

taught, and to challenge the way instruction is being handled. A number of Latin Americans have mentioned to me that students there are more expressive in the classroom and that they are surprised at what they see as the apathy and docility of their peers in the United States.

As for subcategories B3, 4, and 5, we predictably find cultural variation in the types of duties teachers are expected to perform and the abilities they're supposed to have. In some societies there is a greater sense of teacher as scholar or sage, as one who knows a great deal and is highly respected for his knowledge. The expectation of teacher as personal advisor varies too. In some African boarding schools, for example, where students are away from their parents, teachers are often approached with personal problems. In Thailand and Japan there is a much greater tendency for students to have a favorite professor or two to whom they will return for help and guidance even many years after graduation. In this country, some personal tutoring is expected of teachers; that is, teachers have a responsibility for giving students individual attention and extra help. The degree to which this is expected from teachers varies cross-culturally.

An examination of these differences in teacher roles is an enlightening undertaking for much of the miscommunication that occurs in the classroom may come from different expectations regarding the teacher's rights and obligations. I once got very upset with a group of Latin American students for challenging my teaching methods and with a former Taiwanese pupil who returned to visit me and expected an immediate and time consuming favor even though I was no longer his teacher. My anger and frustration would have been spared if I had been aware of two of the cultural patterns that I've just described.

But what are some of the broader implications of cultural differences in the role of the teacher for our consideration of teaching methods? In considering any method or classroom procedure we have to keep in mind that students from societies where there is a high degree of teacher authority and direction may have a low tolerance for ambiguity and difficulty with activities requiring student choice and initiative. Participating in group projects and problem solving activities and choosing a topic for and writing ones own research paper may be very difficult for students from societies where schooling is primarily a matter of "receiving" knowledge that a teacher dispenses. Students need to understand the purpose of such activities and be given concrete guidelines and support in executing them.

Brown (1977), in expressing reservations about Community Language Learning, notes that some students may need more assertive, directive behaviors than are provided for in CLL, and this may be especially true for students from cultures where the teacher is the locus of instruction. Brown also notes the excessive and varied demands made on the teacher who uses this method, and his point has special significance when we consider cultural variation in student expectations of the instructor. In a CLL session the language material comes from the students and the teacher is expected to explain any grammar points that arise in class. There are few teachers knowledgeable enough to deliver clear, accurate, and thorough grammar explanations without advance preparation. For students from a culture where wisdom and thorough knowledge of the subject matter are an even greater expectation of the instructor, faulty explanations may not only give rise to errors in performance, but also seriously undermine teacher credibility and otherwise interfere with instruction.

FIGURE 3

Modes of Learning

GENERAL CULTURE	CULTURE OF THE CLASSROOM
_____	Differences in relative emphasis on:
	A. Inductive/Deductive reasoning
	B. Learning by doing/Observation before doing
	C. Discovery learning/Reception learning
	D. 1. Rote learning, memorization of facts
	2. Problem solving
	3. Creative thinking
	4. Critical evaluation

Proceeding to the third category, Modes of Learning, Hall (1966) has pointed out that people learn to learn differently, and it is important to consider cultural differences in relative emphases placed on various learning strategies. For example, those used to more deductive grammar translation methods may have problems with more inductive audiolingual approaches. Considering subcategory B, some of the studies on the American Indian student have revealed striking differences in the area of learning by doing, and these hold for certain other cultures as well. Philips (1972) notes that in the home setting many Warm Springs Indian children have the opportunity to observe first and then test their skills privately before publicly trying them out. In societies where there is greater prevalence of lecture methods students are not so often put on the spot to perform in front of their peers with little prior preparation. In contrast to this the anthropologist Jules Henry (1976) refers to the American phenomenon of "jamming the machine", of forcing children to do, to perform very early in the learning process, possibly before they are ready. Many of our instructional techniques and language teaching methods reflect this tendency. Some varieties of audiolingualism, for instance, have the student using the pattern immediately prior to little if any explanation of it. Techniques characteristic of a wide variety of methods emphasize student performance at an early stage of instruction, and as teachers we should be aware of minimizing the anxiety arousing effects on some students by giving clear directions, ample models and examples, etc..

Regarding subcategory D, a well attested to and frequently decried phenomenon in many cultures is the emphasis on rote learning and

memorization. Smith (1977), for example, notes the emphasis on learning grammar rules and exceptions in many Asian countries. It may be difficult for these students to shift their energy from memorizing facts to gaining functional mastery over patterns through practice. For students from cultures where the process of education is seen largely as learning a traditional, authoritative body of knowledge or where factors such as class size make problem solving and creative thinking activities impossible, it is important once again to provide clear guidance and orientation. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that preferred problem solving strategies, notions of creativity, and the bases for critical evaluation may differ from one culture to another.

It may also be helpful to draw more on our students preferred modes of learning to help them through language material, especially at the beginning stages of instruction. Students who come from strong rote learning cultures may benefit from a lot of copying work, for example.

Included in the fourth category are types of teacher-student interaction patterns. In considering these patterns it is important to remember that they are influenced by both culture bound notions such as the role of the teacher and the aims of education, and by physical factors such as class size, availability of texts, etc.. In most educational systems we find a variety of interaction patterns being used; the important thing is to find out which ones are predominant in our students' cultures and which ones have never been used at all so that we can better understand where individuals may need special preparation.

FIGURE 4

Teacher-Student Interaction Patterns

GENERAL CULTURE	CULTURE OF THE CLASSROOM
_____	Differences in preferred teacher-student interaction patterns:
	A. Teacher lectures, recites; students take notes, copy
	B. Teacher questions students —Individuals called on —Individuals volunteer
	C. Students ask questions
	D. Students recite, read
	E. Drill —Choral —Individual
	F. Class discussion - students discuss or debate an issue
	G. Group work —Teacher works with a group —Group works on its own to solve a problem, prepare a presentation, etc.
	H. Peer teaching
	I. Students dramatize, role play material
	J. Individual work —Self-paced instruction, programmed learning, etc. —Student merely works by himself
	K. Student gives report, speech

Informants from Japan have said that group research and problem solving activities can be utterly painful for them because of uncertainty in strategies in English for reaching group consensus — an aspect of life highly valued in Japanese society. On the other hand, Philip's (1972) research with the Warm Springs Indian children reveals that these students participate more in self-run student groups than when the teacher is dominating the class in more typical Anglo style. Some students have never given an oral report to the class and are understandably nervous about doing so. Others are not used to the choral drilling typical of many of our oral skills classes and find it to be a strange and uncomfortable experience. Many of our intensive program students who have never been exposed to individualized instruction have difficulty understanding the concept of self-pacing which we use in our beginning level reading and writing classes.

Proceeding finally to the fifth category, ever since the advent of the study of communicative competence, we have been discovering that man's social behavior is intricately regulated by a set of largely unconscious and extremely complex set of social interaction rules. In this framework I note several areas where communicative competence rules regulate interaction in the general culture and designate the particular parallel for the classroom. Since it is impossible here to explore in any depth each category, I will just illustrate how a few differences in social interaction rules have a bearing on classroom practice.

FIGURE 5

Norms of Interaction (Communicative Competence Rules)

GENERAL CULTURE	CULTURE OF THE CLASSROOM
Differences in general communicative competence rules in the following areas:	Differences in classroom communicative competence rules in the following areas:
A. Address forms	A. How students, teachers address one another
B. Silence/participation	B. How much silence/participation are valued and under what conditions they should occur
C. Topics appropriate for discussion	C. What kinds of topics can be discussed in class or written about in compositions
D. Degree of self-disclosure	D. What kinds of and how much factual information and personal opinion it is appropriate for students and teachers to to reveal
E. Getting attention, taking speaking turns, interruping, etc.	E. How teachers get students' attention and vice versa, how speaking turns are taken, who interrupts whom and how, etc.
F. Proxemic patterns - Use of space	F. How seating is arranged, what appropriate distances between student and teacher are
G. Kinesic patterns - Body postures, gestures, and facial expressions	G. What appropriate postures, gestures, and expressions for teachers and students are and what they mean
H. Eye contact patterns	H. What eye contact patterns are used and what they signal
I. Touching patterns	I. What kinds of touching behaviors are appropriate for students and teachers
J. Paralinguistic patterns	J. What various paralinguistic forms and meanings are
K. Speech Acts - For example, greeting, leave taking, introductions, showing approval, showing disapproval, etc.	K. What norms underlie various classroom speech acts such as greeting the students, starting the class, dismissing the class, making introductions, praising and reprimanding students, etc.

Looking at Category B, different cultures vary in their evaluation of student participation in class. Japanese students who are not used to speaking in class often have difficulties in a culture where it is regarded positively to verbally participate. Considering subcategory F, proxemic patterns, I think it is particularly important to compare typical classroom seating arrangements. For individuals from many Arab countries where the sexes are segregated in the classroom and public places, it may be exceedingly uncomfortable to have to sit in a mixed arrangement.

Foreign language teaching methods make use of a wide variety of non-verbal expressions (subcategory G) and it is important to remember that pointing is considered impolite in many cultures, as is the typical American beckoning gesture to call students to the front of the room. (In some places it's used only for animals.) We need to be aware of the interpretations students may be attributing to certain gestures and to understand that failure to respond to certain non-verbal and paralinguistic cues may mean that the students haven't understood them.

As for K, the various speech acts, it seems that reprimanding needs special attention. Sarcastic remarks, or ones that embarass students in front of their peers, may have more than the intended effect if the student is from a strong shame or loss of face culture.

There is much more to be said about cultural differences in classroom communicative competence rules. Further research will enable us to understand such differences better and provide the information necessary to teach our students social interaction rules appropriate to the English speaking classroom.

In conclusion, I think it is necessary to address the issue of where to find the information that will allow us to systematically examine aspects of our teaching methods and classroom practices according to the sort of

framework suggested here. Springer (1977) deplores the lack of comparative work in pedagogy and classroom practice, and until this problem is remedied, we must depend on other resources. But the situation is far from bleak. Within the fields of sociolinguistics, anthropology, educational anthropology, applied linguistics, and intercultural communications there are many sources from which we can extract cross-cultural information that is readily applied to the classroom. Indeed, with the growing concern with linguistic and cultural issues surrounding ethnic minority children, foreign students, and our adult immigrants, we find an increasing amount of information directly relevant to instruction in the ESL/EFL classroom. (See, for example, the works by Althen, Bagnole, Paulston, Philips, and Saville-Troike listed in the references.)

Of course, the multi-cultural classroom itself provides a wealth of information to the inquiring, sensitive observer. Many of us can draw on our experience and that of our colleagues both in the U.S. and abroad in reaching conclusions about cultural differences in the classroom. As Paulston (1975) points out, our students can be effectively used as informants of their own cultures, and this requires us as teachers to behave as amateur anthropologists. A crucial part of the process is knowing what questions to ask. Hopefully, a framework of the sort offered here provides a guideline in the process of exploring cultural differences as they apply to teaching methods and classroom practices. It is a first approximation and my hope is that further thinking and more empirical research will provide additional categories (intercultural differences in motivational techniques, for instance) and furnish a basis for a sound, workable model for the cross-cultural analysis of foreign language teaching methods and classroom practices.

REFERENCES

Althen, Gary (Ed.). 1978. Students from the Arab world and Iran. Washington: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Bagnole, John W. 1976. TEFL, perceptions and the Arab world. Washington: American Friends of the Middle East.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1977. Some limitations of C-L/CLL models of second language teaching. TESOL Quarterly 11, 4:365-372.

Cazden, Courtney B. and Vera P. John. 1971. Learning in American Indian children. Anthropological perspectives on education. Murray L. Wax, Stanley Diamond, and Fred O. Gearing (Eds.). New York: Basic Books, Inc. 252-272.

Condon, John C., and Fathi Yousef. 1975. An Introduction to intercultural communication. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Grove, Cornelius Lee. 1977. The cross-cultural problems of immigrant Portuguese students in American schools. ERIC Document No. ED 151472.

Hall, Edward T. 1966. The silent language. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, Doubleday.

Henry, Jules. 1976. A cross-cultural outline of education. Educational patterns and cultural configurations - the anthropology of education. Joan I. Roberts and Sherrie K. Akinsanya (Eds.). New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 100-170.

Jackson, Philip W. 1968. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Paulston, Christina Bratt. 1975. Linguistic and communicative competence. TESOL Quarterly 8, 4: 347-362.

_____. 1978. Biculturalism: some reflections and speculations. TESOL Quarterly 12, 4:369-380.

Philips, Susan. 1972. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. Functions of language in the classroom. Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes (Eds.). New York: Teachers College Press. 370-394.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1976. Foundations for teaching English as a second language - theory and method for multicultural education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Shimahara, Nobuo. 1978. Socialization for college entrance examinations in Japan. Comparative Education 14, 3.

Smith, Larry E. 1977. Teaching English in Asia - an overview. Culture learning concepts, application, and research. Hawaii: East-West Center. 95-98.

Springer, Ursula. 1977. Education, curriculum and pedagogy. Comparative Education Review 21, 2 & 3: 358-369.